

A.— Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Home and Labour).—

(a), (b) and (c) There is no separate scheme for providing employment to educated unemployed. However, the large number of schemes of the various Departments of Government under Planned and non-Planned sectors have contributed substantially to raising the employment potential.

Drinking Water to Madras and Neyveli Cities from Cauvery

Q.—62. Sri H. D. DEVE GOWDA (Holenarasipur).—

Will the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it has come to the notice of the Government that the Madras Government has prepared a scheme to draw water for drinking purposes to Madras and Neyveli Cities from River Cauvery ;

(b) whether it has come to the notice of Government that the Madras Government have taken steps to implement the Scheme ;

(c) the quantity of water proposed to be utilised for the above purpose ;

(d) whether this Government has given its consent for the same ?

A.— Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works).—

(a) No official information. This has appeared in Press reports.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) Does not arise.

MYSORE APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL, 1967

Leave to introduce.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1967.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“ That leave be granted to introduce the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1967. ”

The motion was adopted.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—I introduce the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1967.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1967, introduced.

I have to inform the House that I have received a message from the Governor, recommending that the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1967, be introduced and considered in the Mysore Legislative Assembly.

MYSORE APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL, 1967

Motion to consider.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1967, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1967, be taken into consideration.”

I have received a very long list of names, which I should not normally receive in the case of Appropriation Bills. I am mentioning to the House that half-an-hour for reply should be sufficient for any points that might be raised because normally on the Appropriation Bill, debate is not allowed; for the simple reason that what has already been approved cannot be disapproved today. But the formalities require that the passing of the Demands, is not by itself sufficient. One more step has to be taken and that step is being taken in the usual form. Therefore, the precedent and convention is that on Appropriation Bill debate is not allowed. I have a list of members who have had no chance to speak. I myself said once or twice that one or two small questions or points may be raised at the time of the Appropriation Bill. I am mentioning this for the purpose of making it clear that this cannot be a precedent for future. It is only to meet the situation that has arisen today that we are going through it.

Does Sri Gopal Gowda like to speak ?

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹಣವಿವರಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ (ಎರಡನೆಯ ಕ್ರಮಾಂಕ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ 1967 ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮುಂಚೆ ಆಯವ್ಯಯ ಮುಂಗಡ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಫೋಟ್ ಆನ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವಾಗ ಎರಡು ದಿವಸಗಳು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದೆ. ಆದಾದಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿ ಈ ಆಯವ್ಯಯ ಪತ್ರದ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಆಳುವ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು, ಮತ್ತು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿಮರ್ಶಾತ್ಮಕವಾದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಟೀಕೆ ಚಪ್ಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ